

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/573,702	MIYASHITA, SHIGEKI
	Examiner BINH Q. TRAN	Art Unit 3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BINH Q. TRAN. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Cady Ryan (Reg. No. 56,762). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 04/30/07

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Katoh et al. (Pat. No. 5,412,945).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Binh Q. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Cady presented argument against the rejection based on Katch et al. . Examiner believes that applicant should further clarify a different structural limitation between amount of the oxygen storage component and NOx storage component. The Examiner will reconsider his position when the response is formally submitted.